DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 062 466 UD 012 325

AUTHOR Brooks, Glenwood C., Jr.; And Others
TITLE A Cross-Cultural Comparison of Danish and U. S. Racial Attitudes.
INSTITUTION Maryland Univ., College Park. Cultural Study Center.
REPORT NO RR-10-71
PUB DATE 71
NOTE 18p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Bias; Comparative Analysis; *Cross Cultural Studies; Cultural Differences; Cultural Images; Culture Contact; *Culture Free Tests; Ethnic Groups; *Ethnic Stereotypes; Group Unity; Interpersonal Relationship; Race; Race Relations; *Racial Attitudes; *Racial Discrimination; Social Attitudes; Sociocultural Patterns

ABSTRACT

Whether there are real differences between attitudes of Danes and Americans toward outgroups or whether publicity and public relations have created the stereotype of each country has not been shown. An outgroup is referred to as a group receiving prejudice and discrimination. If there are basic differences in attitudes toward outgroups in Denmark and the U. S., the nature of these differences may help to understand just how general the concept of attitudes toward outgroups really is. The purpose of this study was to compare Danish and U. S. attitudes toward outgroups in a controlled study. The results of the study, using analysis of variance, indicated that white subjects, whether Danes or Americans, generally hold negative attitudes toward culturally relevant outgroup, but Danes did not feel quite as negative toward Mediterraneans as Americans did toward blacks. The results support the generalizability of the concept of the culturally relevant outgroup. (Author)

ED 062466

CULTURAL STUDY CENTER
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
COLLEGE PARK, MARYLAND

1971

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A CROSS-CULTURAL COMPARISON OF DANISH AND U. S. RACIAL ATTITUDES

Glenwood C. Brooks, Jr., William E. Sedlacek
and Ernest A. Chaples

Research Report # 10-71

UD 012325

CULTURAL STUDY CENTER

A CROSS-CULTURAL COMPARISON OF DANISH AND U.S. RACIAL ATTITUDES

Glenwood C. Brooks, Jr., William E. Sedlacek and Ernest A. Chaples

Research Report # 10-71

SUMMARY

Whether there are real differences between attitudes of Danes and Americans toward outgroups or whether publicity and public relations have created the stereotype of each country has not been shown. An outgroup is referred to as a group receiving prejudice and discrimination. If there are basic differences in attitudes toward outgroups in Denmark and the U.S., the nature of these differences may help us to understand just how general the concept of attitudes toward outgroups really is. The purpose of this study was to compare Danish and U.S. attitudes toward outgroups in a controlled study.

The results of the study, using analysis of variance, indicated that white subjects (*S*s), whether Danish or American, generally hold negative attitudes toward culturally relevant outgroups but Danes did not feel quite as negative toward mediterraneans as Americans did toward blacks. The results support the generalizability of the concept of the culturally relevant outgroup.

In 1957, the U.S. Information Agency solicited opinions from Danes regarding the treatment of Negroes in the U.S. and reported that 82% of the Danes surveyed felt that the treatment of Negroes was "very bad" (Erskine, 1968). Prior to that time and continuing to the present, Danes have absorbed an influx of German immigrants with few apparent problems. Thus Danes appear to have relatively positive attitudes toward outgroup persons. An outgroup is referred to by Dewey and Humber (1966) as a group receiving prejudice and discrimination. It is a dichotomous term, broadly conceived, referring to the existence of a positive reference group, i.e., ingroup, and a negative reference group, i.e., outgroup (Rokeach, 1960).

On the other hand, the image of U.S. racial and ethnic attitudes toward outgroup persons does appear very negative. In the U.S., by a 2 to 1 margin, whites felt that "Negroes were discriminated against and deserved better" (Kosner, 1969, p.45). Additionally, a large body of literature exists indicating that whites in the U.S. hold generally negative attitudes toward blacks (Sedlacek and Brooks, 1970a,b; 1971a,b). However, whether there are real differences between attitudes in the two countries or whether publicity and public relations have created the stereotype of each country has not been shown. Certainly there appears to have been less work done in assessing attitudes toward outgroups in Denmark than there has been in the U.S. If, however, there are basic differences in attitudes toward outgroups in Denmark and the U.S., the nature of these differences may help us to understand just how general the concept of attitudes toward outgroups really is. Rahe (1969) has provided evidence of enough cultural similarity in Denmark and the U.S. to make an attempt to compare the countries on attitudes seem reasonable. He found high agreement among Danes and Americans regarding anticipated life changes ranging from such things as change of residence to retirement from work. The life change events included ordinary aspects of family

relationships, community, and work, along with particular reference to their personal, interpersonal, religious, economic, residential, recreational, and health adjustments.

Thus the purpose of this study was to compare Danish and U.S. attitudes toward outgroups in a controlled study.

Method

The attitudes toward the outgroups were determined from the personal and social situations on the Situational Attitude Scale (SAS). The SAS was originally developed to measure the attitude of whites toward blacks in the U.S., but it is possible to substitute other racial referents in the SAS situations (see Brooks and Sedlacek, 1971). The SAS contains situations representing instances where race might be a variable in reactions to the situation. For each situation, 10 bipolar semantic differential scales were written, making a total of 100 items in the SAS (see Table 1). Two forms of the SAS were developed. Each contains the same situations, bipolar scales and instructions except that the word "black" was inserted into each situation in Form B (see Table 2 for items). The positive pole for each item was varied randomly from right to left to avoid response set.

Since there are few blacks in Denmark the writers felt that the identification of an outgroup more directly relevant to the Danish culture was necessary to conduct the study properly. Interviews with faculty and students at Copenhagen and Aarhus Universities in Denmark revealed the "sydlandsk fremmedarbejder" or "mediterranean foreign worker" (mediterraneans) to be a perceived outgroup. In recent years many mediterraneans (Greeks, Slavs, Turks, Italians, etc.) have come to Denmark largely as laborers. Those interviewed felt that Danes held negative attitudes toward these mediterranean laborers. Thus for the Danish sample, a third form (C) of the SAS was developed. Form A made no mention of race, Form B

contained "neger" for black, and Form C contained "sydlandsk fremmedarbejder" for mediterranean. The A, B, and C forms were translated into Danish in as nearly a verbatim manner as possible for administration to the Danish sample.[1]

The SAS was administered to 306 Danish students at Copenhagen and Aarhus Universities during regular classroom periods in nine different classes and to 405 U.S. students at the University of Maryland during regular classroom periods in seven different classes. Thirty-two questionnaires from the Danish sample were unusable since more than 10 items were left blank. Thirty U.S. questionnaires were unusable since more than 10 items were left blank and 10 were not analyzed since they were completed by black students. The median scale value (scale 0 to 4; 2=median) was assigned to any missing item responses, providing there were 10 items or less blank on a questionnaire. The final usable *N* was 639; Danish: 94 Form A, 90 Form B, and 90 Form C; U.S.: 180 Form A and 185 Form B.

The characteristics of the Danish and U.S. samples were similar with the possible exception of the distribution of male and female subjects (*S*s). Four-fifths of the Danish *S*s were male and one-fifth female, and two-thirds of the U.S. *S*s were male and one-third female. The Danish and U.S. *S*s were drawn from introductory through advanced classes. Institute affiliations for the Danish *S*s were: biology, education, english, history, law, mathematics, philosophy, political science, and psychology. College affiliations for the U.S. *S*s were: Arts and Sciences, Engineering, Business and Public Administration, Education, Graduate, etc. Both samples represented a diverse cross-section of students on the above variables. Other characteristics of the U.S. sample were reported by Sedlacek and Brooks (1970a).

[1] The writers wish to thank Georg Ginsberg, Tyge Jantzen, and Svend-Aage Mortensen for their assistance in translation and data collection. Copies of the Danish instruments are available on request.

Trained white students administered the SAS in both countries. Questionnaires were passed out randomly in each class with each student having an approximately equal chance to receive any form. *S*s had no knowledge that different forms existed. If *S*s had questions, they were requested to come to the front of the room and not to verbalize the question and disturb others. Administration time was 20 to 30 minutes and forms were anonymously completed.

Two separate analyses of variance (fixed effects - .05 level) were conducted. A 2X2 analysis was done with Form (A or B) and Country (Denmark or U.S.) as main effects. A second 2X2 analysis was done with Form (A or outgroup) and Country (Denmark or U.S.) as main effects. Outgroup was defined as Form C for Danish *S*s and Form B for U.S. *S*s. The second analysis would allow a determination of the appropriateness of considering the attitudes of the Danish sample toward mediterraneans as similar to the attitudes of the U.S. sample toward blacks.

Results

First Analysis [A vs B]

In the first analysis (A vs B), 54 SAS items were significant on Form, 70 on Country and 42 on the interaction of these (Table 3). Sakoda, Cohen and Beall (1954) stated that one would expect nine tests in 100 to be significant due to chance at the .05 level. Thus Form, Country and the interaction are well above chance.

The SAS situations which contained at least five significant items on Form were: I (new family next door), III (man selling magazines), IV (corner of loitering men), V (friend becomes engaged), VII (person joins social group), and X (only person standing); on Country were all but VIII (youngster steals); and on the interaction were: I (new family next door), IV (corner of loitering men), V (friend becomes engaged), and VII (person joins social group) (Table 3).

The directionality of the item means (Table 2) on Form indicated that the white *S*s generally responded more negatively toward blacks in situations I (new family next door), V (friend becomes engaged), and X (only person standing) than toward persons whose race was not mentioned and more positively toward blacks in situations III (man selling magazines), IV (corner of loitering men), and VI (stopped by policeman). Situation VII (person joins social group) contained an equal number of positive and negative items on Form. The Danish *S*s responded more positively to situations I (new family next door), II (man raped woman), III (man selling magazines), IV (corner of loitering men), IX (campus demonstration), and X (only person standing) and more negatively to situations VI (stopped by policeman) and VII (person joins social group) than did U.S. *S*s. Situation V (friend becomes engaged) contained an equal number of positive and negative items on Country. The interactions on situations I (new family next door), IV (corner of loitering men), V (friend becomes engaged), and VII (person joins social group) indicated that Danish *S*s responded more positively to blacks than did U.S. *S*s.

Second Analysis [A vs Outgroup (B or C)]

On the second analysis of variance (A vs outgroup) 56 SAS items were significant on Form, 69 on Country and 40 on the interaction of these (Table 3). Thus Form, Country and the interaction are well above chance.

The SAS situations which contained at least five significant items on Form were: I (new family next door), II (man raped woman), IV (corner of loitering men), V (friend becomes engaged), VI (stopped by policeman), and X (only person standing); on Country were all but I (new family next door); and on the interaction were: I (new family next door), IV (corner of loitering men), V (friend becomes engaged), and VI (stopped by policeman) (Table 3).

The directionality of the item means (Table 2) on Form indicated that white *S*s generally responded more negatively toward outgroups in situations I (new family next door), IV (corner of loitering men), V (friend becomes engaged), and X (only person standing) than toward persons whose race or ethnic group was not mentioned and more positively toward outgroups in situation VI (stopped by policeman). The Danish *S*s responded more positively to situations I (new family next door), II (man raped woman), III (man selling magazines), IV (corner of loitering men), IX (campus demonstration), and X (only person standing) and more negatively to situations VI (stopped by policeman) and VIII (youngster steals) than did U.S. *S*s. Situation V (friend becomes engaged) contained an equal number of positive and negative items on Country. The interactions on situations I (new family next door), IV (corner of loitering men), and V (friend becomes engaged) indicated that Danish *S*s responded more positively to mediterraneans than did U.S. *S*s toward blacks. However, in situation VI (stopped by policeman), Danish *S*s responded more negatively toward mediterraneans than did U.S. *S*s toward blacks.

Discussion

The results of this study suggest that white *S*s, whether Danes or Americans, generally hold negative attitudes toward culturally relevant outgroups but Danes did not feel quite as negative toward mediterraneans as U.S. *S*s did toward blacks. The Danish *S*s generally indicated a more friendly attitude toward a mediterranean moving next door to them, felt more positive when passing a corner of loitering mediterraneans, and were somewhat more tolerant toward the intermarriage of Danes and mediterraneans than were U.S. *S*s toward blacks in the above situations. These situations, I (new family next door), V (friend becomes engaged), and VII (person joins social group) respectively, appear to be intimate situations requiring close contact under relatively permanent circumstances. For this reason, they are

considered socially sensitive situations and generally elicit strong negative feelings in the U.S. when blacks are the subject of the situation (Sedlacek and Brooks 1970a,b; 1971a,b).

In the less intimate situations, III (man selling magazines) and VI (stopped by policeman), only VI elicited any differential response. That is, the U.S. *S*s responded more favorably to a black policeman than did Danes toward a mediterranean policeman. Since job opportunities for mediterraneans are restricted, it is likely that Danes have never experienced mediterranean policemen. Amir (1969) has indicated that negative attitudes toward persons of another racial or ethnic group are more likely to occur if little chance for contact with such persons exists, and conversely positive attitudes stem from increased contact. The nature of the contact with persons of an outgroup is important as indicated in situation IV (corner of loitering men). Danish *S*s indicated more favorable attitudes toward mediterraneans loitering on a corner than U.S. *S*s toward blacks, possibly because racial or ethnic conflict has not occurred in Denmark to the extent that it has occurred in the U.S., and the crime rate in Denmark is relatively low compared to the U.S. Triandis *et al.* (1968) have referred to differences by culture as "cultural subjectivity." Cultural subjectivity may help explain why Danes were not as negative toward mediterraneans loitering on a corner as were white Americans toward blacks on a corner.

That Danes have relatively positive attitudes toward blacks and negative attitudes toward mediterraneans,(see Table 3) while Americans have negative attitudes toward blacks, lends support to the generalizability of the concept of culturally relevant outgroups. If an outgroup is physically present and directly participating in the majority culture, in some way negative attitudes toward the outgroup are generated. If the outgroup is removed from a given

culture such as blacks are from Denmark it is relatively easy to be positive toward that outgroup. Obviously a great deal more evidence from other cultures is necessary before such a conclusion could be considered other than tentative. However, this study does provide some evidence that a country with an apparent reputation of being unprejudiced and tolerant, may have achieved that reputation because no one bothered to ask about a culturally relevant outgroup.

REFERENCES

Amir, Y. Contact hypothesis in ethnic relations. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1969, 71, 5, 319-342.

Brooks, G. C., Jr., & Sedlacek, W. E. Choice of racial referent as a variable in racial attitude measurement. *Cultural Study Center Research Report # 5-71*, University of Maryland, 1971.

Dewey, R., & Humber, W. J. *An introduction to social psychology*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1966. Pp. 356-420.

Erskine, H. The polls: World opinion of U.S. racial problems. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 1968, 32, 302.

Kosner, E. (Ed.) The troubled American: A special report on the white majority. *Newsweek*, 1969, 64, 28-73.

Rahe, R. H. Multi-cultural correlations of life change scaling: America, Japan, Denmark and Sweden. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 1969, 13, 191-195.

Rokeach, M. *The open and closed mind*. New York: Basic Books, 1960. Pp. 9-10.

Sakoda, J. M., Cohen, B. H., & Beall, G. Tests of significance for a series of statistical tests. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1954, 51, 172-175.

Sedlacek, W. E., & Brooks, G. C., Jr. Measuring racial attitudes in a situational context. *Psychological Reports*, 1970a, 27, 971-980.

Sedlacek, W. E., & Brooks, G. C., Jr. The measurement of attitudes of whites toward blacks with certain beliefs. *Cultural Study Center Research Report # 7-70*, University of Maryland, 1970b. Also presented at the National Council on Measurement in Education Convention, New York, February 7, 1971.

Sedlacek, W. E., & Brooks, G. C., Jr. Social acceptability in the measurement of racial attitudes. *Psychological Reports*, 1971a, 29, 17-18.

Sedlacek, W. E., Brooks, G. C., Jr., & Chaples. E. A. Problems in measuring racial attitudes: An experimental approach. *Cultural Study Center Research Report # 11-71*, University of Maryland, 1971b.

Triandis, H. C., Vassiliow, V., & Nassiakou, M. Three cross-cultural studies of subjective culture. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology Monograph Supplement*, 1968, 8, Part 2.

Instructions and Situations from the Situational Attitude Scale*

INSTRUCTIONS

This questionnaire measures how people think and feel about a number of social and personal incidents and situations. It is not a test so there are no right or wrong answers. The questionnaire is anonymous so please DO NOT SIGN YOUR NAME.

Each item or situation is followed by 10 descriptive word scales. Your task is to select, for each descriptive scale, the rating which best describes YOUR feelings toward the item.

Sample item: Going out on a date

happy ____A____B____C____D____E____ sad

You would indicate the direction and extent of your feelings (e.g., you might select B) by indicating your choice (B) on your response sheet by blackening in the appropriate space for that word scale. DO NOT MARK ON THE BOOKLET. PLEASE RESPOND TO ALL WORD SCALES.

Sometimes you may feel as though you had the same item before on the questionnaire. This will not be the case, so DO NOT LOOK BACK AND FORTH through the items. Do not try to remember how you checked similar items earlier in the questionnaire. MAKE EACH ITEM A SEPARATE AND INDEPENDENT JUDGMENT. Respond as honestly as possible without puzzling over individual items. Respond with your first impressions whenever possible.

SITUATIONS

Form A	Form B	Form C
I. A new family moves in next door to you.	A new black family moves in next door to you.	A new Mediterranean foreign worker's family moves in next door to you.
II. You read in the paper that a man has raped a woman.	You read in the paper that a black man has raped a white woman.	You read in the paper that a Mediterranean foreign worker has raped a woman.
III. It is evening and a man appears at your door saying he is selling magazines.	It is evening and a black man appears at your door saying he is selling magazines.	It is evening and a Mediterranean foreign worker appears at your door saying he is selling magazines.
IV. You are walking down the street alone and must pass a corner where a group of five young men are loitering.	You are walking down the street alone and must pass a corner where a group of five young black men are loitering.	You are walking down the street alone and must pass a corner where a group of five young Mediterranean foreign workers are loitering.
V. Your best friend has just become engaged.	Your best friend has just become engaged to a black person.	Your best friend has just become engaged to a Mediterranean foreign worker.
VI. You are stopped for speeding by a policeman.	You are stopped for speeding by a black policeman.	You are stopped for speeding by a policeman who is a Mediterranean foreign worker.
VII. A new person joins your social group.	A new black person joins your social group.	A Mediterranean foreign worker joins your social group.
VIII. You see a youngster steal something in a dimestore.	You see a black youngster steal something in a dimestore.	You see the child of a Mediterranean foreign worker steal something in a dimestore.
IX. Some students on campus stage a demonstration.	Some black students on campus stage a demonstration.	Some Mediterranean guest students stage a demonstration.
X. You get on a bus and you are the only person who has to stand.	You get on a bus that has all black people aboard and you are the only person who has to stand.	You get on a bus that has all Mediterranean foreign workers aboard and you are the only person who has to stand.

* The Situational Attitude Scale is copyrighted and available from the Cultural Study Center, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742, U.S.A.

TABLE 2

Means and Standard Deviations for Danish and American SAS Forms[a]

ITEM NO.	SITUATIONS[b] BIPOLAR ADJECTIVE DIMENSION	DANISH FORM A (*N*=94) MEAN	S.D.	DANISH FORM B (*N*=90) MEAN	S.D.	DANISH FORM C (*N*=90) MEAN	S.D.	AMERICAN FORM A(*N*=180) MEAN	S.D.	AMERICAN FORM B(*N*=185) MEAN	S.D.
	I. NEW FAMILY NEXT DOOR										
1	good-bad	1.30	0.96	1.27	1.05	1.57	0.96	1.14	0.94	1.85	1.08
2	safe-unsafe	1.64	1.00	0.92	0.97	1.39	0.97	1.03	0.92	1.32	1.12
3	angry-not angry	3.42	0.98	3.62	0.84	3.23	1.11	3.42	0.98	3.05	1.17
4	friendly-unfriendly	0.88	0.90	0.74	0.91	0.88	0.99	0.78	0.87	1.12	1.06
5	sympathetic-not sympathetic	1.28	0.98	1.06	0.90	1.13	1.00	1.55	1.13	1.83	1.27
6	nervous-calm	2.96	1.15	3.28	1.04	3.00	1.07	2.99	1.08	2.71	1.20
7	happy-sad	1.56	0.85	1.60	0.75	1.81	0.78	1.27	0.86	1.85	1.08
8	objectionable-acceptable	3.36	0.93	3.61	0.75	3.32	0.93	3.18	0.95	2.75	1.33
9	desirable-undesirable	1.62	0.95	1.49	0.89	1.70	0.99	1.27	0.95	1.86	1.22
10	suspicious-trusting	2.57	1.16	3.06	0.95	2.58	1.02	2.77	0.92	2.49	1.12
	II. MAN RAPED WOMAN										
11	affection-disgust	3.16	0.88	3.24	0.87	3.04	0.99	3.43	0.85	3.56	0.78
12	relish-repulsion	3.21	0.96	3.39	0.82	3.21	0.92	3.31	0.85	3.49	0.79
13	happy-sad	2.85	0.94	3.08	0.86	3.01	0.98	3.33	0.85	3.59	0.73
14	friendly-hostile	2.78	0.88	2.62	1.00	2.53	1.02	3.12	0.88	3.16	0.91
15	uninvolved-involved	2.09	1.16	1.98	1.38	2.11	1.33	1.87	1.34	2.06	1.36
16	hope-hopelessness	2.17	0.96	2.18	0.98	1.98	0.85	2.06	1.07	2.23	1.05
17	aloof-outraged	1.17	1.12	1.21	1.07	1.54	1.09	2.55	0.95	2.64	1.03
18	injure-kill	1.89	0.73	1.96	0.65	1.81	0.60	1.52	1.14	1.48	1.22
19	safe-fearful	1.83	0.99	1.82	1.00	1.98	0.72	2.10	1.29	2.25	1.20
20	empathetic-can't understand	1.79	1.19	1.86	1.06	1.66	1.04	2.02	1.22	2.34	1.23
	III. MAN SELLING MAGAZINES										
21	relaxed-startled	1.13	1.26	0.80	1.00	0.74	1.02	1.80	1.17	1.90	1.29
22	receptive-cautious	2.36	1.38	1.64	1.34	1.67	1.38	2.86	1.03	2.50	1.35
23	excited-unexcited	2.99	1.01	3.38	0.87	3.41	0.87	2.98	1.01	2.41	1.13
24	glad-angered	2.17	0.79	1.89	0.73	2.02	0.56	2.45	0.76	2.15	0.67
25	pleased-annoyed	2.45	1.03	2.17	1.05	2.28	0.92	2.94	0.83	2.61	0.84
26	indifferent-suspicious	1.92	1.34	1.28	1.15	1.39	1.22	2.18	1.36	1.81	1.37
27	tolerable-intolerable	1.59	1.07	0.97	1.03	1.00	1.01	1.71	1.05	1.36	1.15
28	afraid-secure	2.88	0.98	3.09	0.92	2.96	1.15	2.41	1.06	2.20	1.14
29	friend-enemy	1.90	0.87	1.56	0.85	1.54	0.86	2.05	0.70	1.75	0.75
30	unprotected-protected	2.64	1.05	2.88	0.95	2.72	0.97	2.49	1.01	2.38	1.09

[a] Scale A to E (Numerical equivalent, 0 to 4).
[b] See Table 1 for complete situation.

Means and Standard Deviations for Danish and American SAS Forms[a]
(Continued)

ITEM NO.	SITUATIONS[b] BIPOLAR ADJECTIVE DIMENSION	DANISH FORM A (*N*=94) MEAN	S.D.	FORM B (*N*=90) MEAN	S.D.	FORM C (*N*=90) MEAN	S.D.	AMERICAN FORM A(*N*=180) MEAN	S.D.	FORM B(*N*=185) MEAN	S.D.
	IV. CORNER OF LOITERING MEN										
31	relaxed-tensed	2.31	1.29	1.71	1.42	1.30	1.22	2.84	1.05	3.02	1.12
32	pleased-angered	2.01	0.87	1.57	0.85	1.67	0.73	2.26	0.58	2.32	0.75
33	superior-inferior	2.12	0.88	2.24	0.68	1.96	0.69	1.88	0.91	1.90	0.75
34	smarter-dumber	1.65	0.90	1.78	0.49	1.70	0.61	1.33	0.83	1.55	0.79
35	whiter-blacker	1.43	1.00	1.99	1.04	1.98	0.99	1.69	0.72	1.17	0.95
36	aggressive-passive	2.48	1.28	2.91	1.17	2.88	1.16	2.26	1.10	2.58	0.98
37	safe-unsafe	2.21	1.26	1.87	1.15	1.38	1.17	2.61	0.94	2.72	1.02
38	friendly-unfriendly	1.63	0.95	1.31	0.98	1.21	1.00	2.31	0.98	2.05	1.07
39	excited-unexcited	2.25	1.20	2.73	1.04	2.89	1.24	1.76	0.90	1.82	1.17
40	trivial-important	1.80	0.99	1.79	0.84	1.74	0.84	1.72	1.06	1.96	1.11
	V. FRIEND BECOMES ENGAGED										
41	aggressive-passive	2.38	1.14	3.13	1.04	2.81	1.11	1.72	1.23	2.27	1.27
42	happy-sad	1.00	1.13	0.93	0.97	1.41	1.02	0.53	0.86	1.85	1.38
43	tolerable-intolerable	0.81	1.09	0.46	0.86	0.73	0.96	0.47	0.85	1.21	1.35
44	complimented-insulted	1.88	0.60	1.82	0.61	2.03	0.44	0.88	0.93	1.89	1.10
45	angered-overjoyed	2.52	0.90	2.56	0.85	2.19	0.70	3.25	0.78	1.99	1.05
46	secure-fearful	1.42	1.06	1.00	0.99	1.34	1.07	1.00	1.07	1.45	1.25
47	hopeful-hopeless	1.39	1.06	0.98	0.97	1.33	1.06	0.67	0.85	1.39	1.36
48	excited-unexcited	2.82	1.19	3.33	1.04	3.03	1.11	0.80	0.98	1.68	1.15
49	right-wrong	1.18	1.09	0.83	1.03	1.22	1.12	0.82	0.99	1.88	1.40
50	disgusting-pleasing	2.81	0.99	2.73	0.87	2.47	0.80	3.50	0.78	2.13	1.28
	VI. STOPPED BY POLICEMAN										
51	calm-nervous	2.63	1.37	2.17	1.55	1.80	1.46	2.96	1.21	2.41	1.54
52	trusting-suspicious	2.26	1.20	1.60	1.24	1.92	1.37	1.98	1.22	1.00	1.08
53	afraid-safe	1.77	1.13	2.10	1.18	2.30	1.25	1.72	1.32	2.76	1.34
54	friendly-unfriendly	1.34	1.27	1.16	1.12	1.27	1.19	1.41	1.19	0.89	1.03
55	tolerant-intolerant	1.40	1.17	1.12	1.17	1.32	1.13	1.28	1.18	0.62	0.89
56	bitter-pleasant	2.36	1.20	2.17	1.19	2.16	1.14	2.09	1.24	2.75	1.18
57	cooperative-uncooperative	1.21	1.18	1.09	1.21	1.10	1.26	0.53	0.87	0.40	0.79
58	acceptive-belligerent	1.29	1.16	1.29	1.14	1.27	1.14	0.94	1.12	0.65	0.85
59	inferior-superior	1.69	0.98	1.87	0.88	1.89	0.93	1.82	1.03	1.85	0.71
60	smarter-dumber	1.60	0.86	1.87	0.72	1.66	0.78	1.72	0.99	1.90	0.64

[a] Scale A to E (Numerical equivalent, 0 to 4).
[b] See Table 1 for complete situation.

TABLE 2

Means and Standard Deviations for Danish and American SAS Forms[a]
(Continued)

ITEM NO.	SITUATIONS[b] BIPOLAR ADJECTIVE DIMENSION	DANISH FORM A (*N*=94) MEAN	S.D.	FORM B (*N*=90) MEAN	S.D.	FORM C (*N*=90) MEAN		AMERICAN FORM A(*N*=180) MEAN	S.D.	FORM B(*N*=185) MEAN	S.D.
	VII. PERSON JOINS SOCIAL GROUP										
61	warm-cold	1.42	0.93	1.16	1.09	1.42	0.97	1.01	0.93	1.01	1.01
62	sad-happy	2.83	0.86	2.84	0.96	2.66	0.84	2.91	0.82	2.61	1.11
63	superior-inferior	1.82	0.64	2.06	0.55	1.84	0.39	1.65	0.63	1.85	0.52
64	threatened-neutral	2.96	1.15	3.43	0.98	3.19	1.02	3.28	0.99	3.35	1.06
65	pleased-displeased	1.55	0.96	1.57	0.91	1.60	0.80	1.04	0.84	1.42	1.19
66	understanding-indifferent	1.25	0.96	1.52	1.39	1.43	1.41	1.05	1.01	1.18	1.26
67	suspicious-trusting	2.57	0.95	3.08	0.93	2.76	1.11	2.80	0.92	2.91	1.12
68	disappointed-elated	2.54	0.81	2.51	0.80	2.29	0.71	2.56	0.71	2.34	1.02
69	favorable-unfavorable	0.95	0.96	0.67	0.94	0.92	1.00	0.97	0.85	1.22	1.24
70	uncomfortable-comfortable	2.55	1.02	2.92	1.00	2.72	0.98	2.91	0.99	2.75	1.25
	VIII. YOUNGSTER STEALS										
71	surprising-not surprising	2.66	1.46	2.04	1.21	2.33	1.32	2.49	1.43	2.58	1.21
72	sad-happy	1.31	1.00	1.33	1.15	1.28	0.91	0.93	0.95	0.76	0.85
73	disinterested-interested	2.60	1.25	1.94	1.38	1.89	1.43	2.77	1.22	2.65	1.15
74	close-distant	1.53	1.31	1.80	1.35	2.07	1.48	1.83	1.20	1.97	1.19
75	understandable-baffling	1.34	1.16	1.43	1.12	1.42	1.15	1.42	1.27	1.23	0.98
76	responsible-not responsible	2.25	1.28	2.07	1.23	1.91	1.12	2.21	1.28	2.29	1.23
77	concerned-unconcerned	1.43	1.25	1.76	1.23	2.02	1.36	1.11	1.20	1.25	1.22
78	sympathy-indifference	1.76	1.23	1.79	1.24	2.11	1.47	1.66	1.20	1.63	1.17
79	expected-unexpected	1.55	1.14	2.29	1.07	2.12	0.95	1.85	1.08	1.82	1.05
80	hopeful-hopeless	1.95	1.00	1.83	0.93	1.98	0.89	1.75	1.04	1.74	1.03
	IX. CAMPUS DEMONSTRATION										
81	bad-good	2.70	1.23	3.01	0.98	2.77	1.15	2.08	1.12	1.77	1.34
82	understanding-indifferent	1.14	1.32	1.18	1.35	1.28	1.34	1.60	1.13	1.70	1.31
83	suspicious-trusting	2.37	1.09	2.74	0.91	2.46	1.16	1.61	1.01	1.77	1.14
84	safe-unsafe	1.45	1.02	1.46	1.07	1.44	1.07	1.67	1.18	1.83	1.31
85	disturbed-undisturbed	2.17	1.08	2.63	1.07	2.42	1.08	1.80	1.20	1.70	1.33
86	justified-unjustified	1.28	1.04	1.13	0.93	1.67	1.10	1.77	0.99	1.77	1.23
87	tense-calm	2.43	1.19	2.72	1.27	2.69	1.22	2.16	1.21	1.98	1.24
88	hate-love	2.38	0.82	2.37	0.76	2.29	0.71	2.08	0.79	1.93	0.83
89	wrong-right	2.69	1.04	2.72	0.95	2.37	1.09	2.06	0.97	2.01	1.17
90	humorous-serious	2.42	1.11	2.80	1.11	2.61	1.06	2.44	1.19	3.03	0.95

[a] Scale A to E (Numerical equivalent, 0 to 4).
[b] See Table 1 for complete situation.

TABLE 2

Means and Standard Deviations for Danish and American SAS Forms[a]
(Continued)

ITEM NO.	SITUATIONS[b] BIPOLAR ADJECTIVE DIMENSION	DANISH FORM A (*N*=94) MEAN	S.D.	DANISH FORM B (*N*=90) MEAN	S.D.	DANISH FORM C (*N*=90) MEAN	S.D.	AMERICAN FORM A(*N*=180) MEAN	S.D.	AMERICAN FORM B(*N*=185) MEAN	S.D.
	X. ONLY PERSON STANDING										
91	fearful-secure	2.87	1.13	2.67	1.14	2.81	1.12	2.73	1.10	2.11	1.30
92	tolerable-intolerable	0.94	1.13	0.93	1.16	0.86	1.06	0.98	1.03	1.09	1.09
93	hostile-indifferent	3.33	0.97	3.24	1.03	3.30	1.08	3.10	1.09	2.88	1.07
94	important-trivial	2.79	1.14	2.86	1.12	2.83	1.05	3.27	1.00	2.83	1.22
95	conspicuous-inconspicuous	2.35	1.33	2.07	1.57	2.20	1.44	1.73	1.32	0.97	1.17
96	calm-anxious	0.86	1.11	0.77	1.14	0.97	1.08	1.26	1.24	1.90	1.37
97	indignant-understanding	3.11	1.04	2.92	1.12	2.88	0.93	2.99	1.11	2.74	1.04
98	comfortable-uncomfortable	1.57	1.20	1.50	1.18	1.57	1.02	2.17	1.37	2.40	1.35
99	hate-love	2.32	0.77	2.23	0.74	2.21	0.65	2.12	0.73	2.02	0.71
100	not resentful-resentful	0.93	1.12	0.73	0.99	0.86	1.11	0.98	1.19	1.08	1.14

[a] Scale A to E (Numerical equivalent, 0 to 4).
[b] See Table 1 for complete situation.

TABLE 3

F Values for Danish and American SAS Forms[a]

ITEM NO.	FORM A VS. B			FORM A VS. OUTGROUP		
	Form	Country	F x C	Form	Country	F x C
1	29.13*	5.47*	16.49*	43.97*	0.52	6.01*
2	0.31	1.49	30.23*	1.47	14.04*	8.72*
3	4.21*	9.30*	9.60*	11.35*	0.88	0.93
4	4.28*	2.48	7.63*	7.33*	0.63	3.83*
5	1.62	26.55*	6.16*	2.32	22.27*	4.30*
6	0.76	6.56*	8.72*	3.27	1.45	2.50
7	26.15*	0.09	10.93*	35.58*	2.37	4.13*
8	5.44*	28.75*	12.55*	10.89*	14.36*	3.98*
9	15.64*	0.01	14.67*	21.79*	1.05	7.14*
10	0.08	3.75*	16.19*	4.08*	0.33	2.15
11	2.78	15.36*	0.09	0.53	25.93*	2.48
12	6.53*	1.64	0.00	2.94	5.68*	1.45
13	12.79*	43.60*	0.04	10.19*	47.26*	0.39
14	0.06	28.92*	1.40	0.37	34.72*	2.95
15	0.60	0.31	1.51	1.36	1.25	0.46
16	1.74	0.09	0.77	0.34	0.60	3.96*
17	1.15	227.17*	0.06	5.31*	175.26*	2.35
18	0.02	20.10*	0.30	0.47	14.01*	0.05
19	1.04	10.83*	0.55	2.49	6.97*	0.00
20	5.74*	10.89*	1.40	3.08	17.86*	4.48*
21	0.07	66.48*	3.93	0.20	70.26*	4.98*
22	18.96*	35.36*	2.48	18.13*	33.78*	2.16
23	8.37*	27.04*	26.27	7.66*	28.88*	28.11*
24	21.59*	17.00*	0.02	16.65*	10.44*	1.40
25	15.86*	32.24*	0.11	12.99*	26.40*	1.06
26	15.83*	10.90*	1.26	13.20*	7.98*	0.43
27	21.70*	6.84*	1.96	20.78*	6.03*	1.53
28	0.91	51.21*	4.93*	1.94	39.02*	2.16
29	22.48*	5.96*	0.13	22.86*	6.30*	0.19
30	0.00	11.76*	3.63	0.36	6.73*	1.14
31	0.50	73.59*	12.95*	4.44*	116.90*	32.44*
32	2.44	54.76*	14.32*	1.15	46.90*	9.75*
33	0.62	15.49*	0.48	0.33	3.97*	1.59
34	7.60*	14.76*	0.40	5.45*	10.51*	1.35
35	4.59*	10.91*	44.21*	4.89*	10.69*	44.20*
36	14.46*	7.55*	0.27	13.63*	6.69*	0.13
37	0.12	41.59*	5.71*	4.40*	80.03*	24.20*
38	9.33*	61.01*	0.13	11.72*	69.34*	0.82
39	4.48*	52.66*	4.91*	6.71*	60.83*	8.55*
40	3.19	0.20	1.78	2.63	0.47	2.47
41	34.91*	49.40*	0.87	23.38*	30.34*	0.30
42	80.05*	4.61*	46.51*	110.65*	0.04	19.68*
43	16.89*	4.23*	31.41*	25.34*	0.42	17.11*
44	69.49*	33.92*	42.84*	88.47*	52.37*	28.65*
45	112.91*	1.13	61.91*	155.15*	11.20*	33.32*
46	2.78	0.02	18.15*	7.93*	2.38	6.42*
47	13.06*	2.71	32.89*	23.02*	11.42*	15.18*
48	61.01*	349.78*	3.37	44.72*	289.81*	11.08*
49	35.06*	10.09*	44.14*	50.67*	1.78	22.52*
50	115.65*	0.30	49.37*	141.03*	3.99*	31.76*

Note.- Form, Country and F x C df=1.

[a] Complete summary table available from the Cultural Study Center upon request.

* Significant at .05 level.

TABLE 3

F Values for Danish and American SAS Forms[a]
(Continued)

ITEM NO.	FORM A VS. B			FORM A VS. OUTGROUP		
	Form	Country	F x C	Form	Country	F x C
51	18.26*	5.12*	0.12	28.42*	13.88*	1.21
52	76.50*	16.95*	2.31	57.01*	30.42*	8.86*
53	54.96*	6.95*	9.28*	63.20*	3.10	4.66*
54	17.28*	0.90	2.54	14.04*	2.15	4.45*
55	33.77*	9.87*	3.73*	26.40*	17.43*	8.80*
56	13.17*	1.87	15.24*	13.09*	2.03	15.85*
57	2.76	61.63*	0.00	2.57	61.32*	0.01
58	5.19*	26.71*	2.46	5.57*	25.56*	2.11
59	1.11	0.54	0.78	1.29	0.35	1.01
60	9.46*	1.13	0.33	4.28*	5.97*	0.71
61	1.19	9.61*	2.12	0.00	21.94*	0.00
62	5.74*	0.85	3.30	10.33*	0.03	0.55
63	17.52*	12.69*	0.13	8.41*	2.68	2.90
64	5.42*	1.59	4.70*	2.02	6.42*	0.75
65	8.56*	13.61*	4.03*	9.61*	15.45*	3.43
66	3.09	6.55*	0.51	2.13	4.56*	0.08
67	8.05*	0.11	4.82*	2.40	4.18*	0.16
68	4.72*	0.95	1.50	10.36*	0.21	0.05
69	0.69	9.44*	7.99*	3.14	2.87	2.06
70	0.04	0.95	7.18*	0.25	3.93	2.79
71	1.69	2.27	8.47*	0.21	0.10	2.85
72	2.01	29.75*	1.34	2.95	28.92*	0.77
73	7.83*	15.52*	5.64*	8.68*	17.23*	6.77*
74	3.09	4.48*	0.33	6.42*	0.86	2.98
75	0.91	0.35	1.82	0.97	0.29	1.67
76	0.00	0.66	1.36	0.24	2.28	3.53
77	3.66	13.63*	0.72	7.31*	23.06*	4.09*
78	0.00	1.38	0.07	0.87	6.52*	2.84
79	6.05*	0.70	15.35*	3.62	0.00	9.73*
80	0.34	2.63	0.29	0.00	5.86*	0.06
81	1.41	73.85*	8.37*	3.73*	53.56*	2.97
82	0.63	18.45*	0.06	1.21	14.97*	0.03
83	5.72*	83.02*	1.28	1.67	53.72*	0.14
84	1.28	7.86*	0.50	1.20	8.15*	0.58
85	0.55	35.50*	6.72*	0.01	24.91*	2.63
86	0.21	33.80*	0.52	1.99	9.11*	3.94*
87	0.05	20.39*	4.44*	0.10	19.37*	3.89*
88	2.56	25.97*	0.82	3.96*	21.24*	0.14
89	0.14	50.07*	0.18	2.70	26.15*	2.02
90	31.29*	1.68	1.01	24.69*	5.15*	3.94*
91	23.53*	10.49*	3.84*	19.32*	15.35*	6.98*
92	0.61	1.08	0.32	0.27	2.11	0.95
93	3.95*	9.65*	0.49	3.15	11.37*	0.97
94	7.98*	5.21*	6.45*	8.57*	5.83*	6.02*
95	29.64*	51.62*	3.96*	26.56*	62.15*	6.74*
96	14.80*	45.35*	10.78*	20.20*	34.86*	5.84*
97	6.40*	2.43	0.13	7.65*	1.88	0.02
98	1.46	39.78*	1.58	2.04	37.64*	0.98
99	2.33	9.82*	0.01	2.81	9.15*	0.01
100	0.00	3.89*	2.02	0.20	1.85	0.65

Note.- Form, Country and F x C df=1
[a] Complete summary table available from the Cultural Study Center upon request.
* Significant at .05 level.